

AMENDMENT UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 10/529,759

Attorney Docket No. Q87091

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Applicants have amended Fig. 1 to remove the reference numerals “102” and “103.”

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 have been examined and have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

**I. Objection to the drawings**

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because the specification does not mention the reference numerals “102” and “103” shown in Fig. 1. Applicants submit that the amendments to the drawings overcome the objection.

**II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Japanese Patent Document No. 2000-252550 (“JP ‘550”)**

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP ‘550.

**A. Claim 1**

Since claim 1 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, the rejection of the claim is moot.

**B. Claim 2**

Since claim 2 indirectly depends upon claim 3, and since claim 3 is not anticipated by JP ‘550 for at least the reasons presented below, Applicants submit that claim 2 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

**C. Claim 3**

Applicants submit that claim 3 is patentable over the reference. For example, claim 3 states that an image plane is composed of a plurality of pixels and that the pixels each have two or more subpixels. Furthermore, the claim states that the two or more subpixels have emission areas, which have sizes that are different from each other.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner seems to suggest that Figs. 3, 4, 13, and 14 and Paragraph 0052 of JP '550 suggest subpixels that have emission areas having different sizes. However, Applicants respectfully disagree because the figures do not show subpixels having emission areas with different sizes. Also, Paragraph 0052 and the remaining portions of the reference do not mention different sized emission areas.

**D. Claim 4**

Since claim 4 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, the rejection of the claim is moot.

**E. Claims 5 and 6**

Since claims 5 and 6 depend upon claim 3, Applicants submit that they are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**III. Newly added claims**

Applicants have added new claims 7-11. Since claim 8 contains features that are analogous to some of the features recited in claim 3, Applicants submit that it is patentable for similar reasons. Also, since claims 7 and 9-11 depend upon claim 3 or 8, Applicants submit that they are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 10/529,759

Attorney Docket No. Q87091

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER



Grant K. Rowan  
Registration No. 41,278

Date: December 7, 2006